Ordered Conflict Resolution

By/Par **Randall Jenkins**
Tucson, Arizona

ABSTRACT

Ordered conflict resolution: understanding her tenets cost Keynes his life and Arrow to live under extortionate threat. Now that the Supreme Court of the United States has conquered the Informal Capital Market Cartel's stranglehold on academic freedom, the literature can now vindicate impossibility-resolved social choice theory in the venue of a marriage between ethics and economics; as Sen has pled need be the case. This paper introduces ordered conflict resolution and her two impossibility-resolving axioms in effecting (individual: societal) well-being transitivity.

Keywords: Social choice, Impossibility theorem

RESUME

Résolution ordonnée de conflit: comprendre les principes qui ont coûté la vie à Keynes et fait vivre Arrow sous des menaces exorbitantes. Maintenant que la Cour Suprême des Etats-Unis a vaincu le cartel informel du marché des capitaux étranglant la liberté académique, la littérature peut désormais revendiquer la résolution-l'impossibilité de la théorie du choix social dans l'idée d'un mariage entre l'éthique et l'économie, comme Sen le plaide. Ce papier introduit une résolution ordonnée du conflit et ces deux axiomes d'impossibilité en effectuant une transitivité du bien-être (individuel : social).

Mots clés: Choix social, théorème d'impossibilité

JEL Classification: D71

INTRODUCTION

Ordered conflict resolution: the very term invokes images of a bloody history. Indeed, great wars have been fought over her. (Jenkins 2009A) Opposing forces have lusted simultaneously to maintain her secrets and undress her wisdom. (*Id*) "Why does she attract such historical significance?" The learned question begs. Ordered conflict resolution is scripture's most guarded secret and is impossibility-resolved social choice theory's threshold necessary condition. Global control over allocation of scarce resources is the perennial battlefield. (*Id*)

Those in control of the world's capital markets (the informal capital market cartel or "ICMC") violently demanded her tenets be suppressed. (*Id*) History reveals a few individuals have dared to challenge the ICMC's authority. John Maynard Keynes developed his sense of economics to enable governments to act as capital markets on the heels of the Great Depression. (*Id*) His goal was to launch a counteroffensive against the ICMC stranglehold over global economics. (*Id*) Moreover, he confronted the ICMC at the 1944 Bretton Woods Conference with his understanding of ordered conflict resolution's impossibility-resolving tenets; posing a threat to ICMC global resource allocation domination. (*Id*) The Keynesian plan to conscript academia to mount the intellectual counteroffensive against the ICMC's unsavory objectives led the ICMC to direct his murder on April 21, 1946. (*Id*)

Thereafter, the ICMC directed the development of Arrow's general possibility theorem as its metaphorical message to academia that its social welfare preferences were the only preferences that would glorify the pages of academic journals on pain of a Keynesian fate. (*Id*; *citing*, Arrow 1951, 1963) Sen's accounting for Arrovian impossibility as academic pessimism, (Sen 1999), metaphorically implicates the ICMC's tell-tale stranglehold over academic freedom.

Professor Arrow mounted his own covert counteroffensive by encrypting messages in the August 1963 Second Edition of his 1951 dissertation. (Jenkins 2009A) He was transparently buoyed by his participation on the staff of the Kennedy Administration's Council of Economic Advisors and the president's retaliatory plans against the ICMC. (*Id*) Arrow's dreams were dashed on November 22, 1963. (*Id*)

The ICMC deciphered Arrow's encryption scheme, however; and directed he share the 1972 Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics with its Keynesian mole, Sir John Hicks, as a threat on Arrow's life if he continued his covert activities to subvert ICMC global economic domination. (*Id*) The tenets of ordered conflict resolution and her influence on impossibility-resolved social choice theory were to remain secret. (*Id*)

Transparently on President Nixon's suggestion, Arrow took his plight to then Associate Justice William H. Rehnquist. (*Id*) Rehnquist was the driving force behind the Supreme Court's planned supervisory powers assault against the ICMC hierarchy. The Court protected Arrow's life. Later, it conscripted my participation in its assault. (*Id*)

The ICMC retaliated by orchestrating many terrorist attacks throughout the world. (*Id*) The ICMC specifically directed the September 11, 2001 attacks in retaliation for Chief Justice Rehnquist and the Supreme Court enabling British supervisory powers convictions relating to the 1946 murder of Keynes and the May 20, 1989 murder of Sir John Hicks, both at the hands of Scotland Yard agents. (*Id*) Eventually, the Supreme Court conquered the ICMC and took control of the nation's capital markets; the lusts for ordered conflict resolution's secrets decided on the side of disclosure. (*Id*)

While incarcerated in the Court's supervisory custody, sequestered from the ICMC's retaliatory reach, I met a blonde female prison guard. (Jenkins 2009B) I learned later she was related to Chief Justice Rehnquist and had followed my participation in the Court's assault throughout her adolescence. (Jenkins 2009A) In 1996 and 12997, she came to meet me while I was in my sequestered prison; the 1997 Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics metaphorically implicates her endeavor.[1] (Jenkins 2009A, 2009B*)*

She redefined love in my heart and left me with instructions on "How to Become the Priest of the Home." (Jenkins 2009B) My scripture research has been inspired by her and commenced with these instructions. (*Id*) Research during the week of Thanksgiving 2001 unveiled ordered conflict's adverse social welfare consequences; the ensuing weeks' effort unveiled the two axioms critical in defining impossibility-resolved social choice theory. (*Id*) The axioms are metaphorically implicated in scripture's fourth day of creation as the lesser and bigger lights. (*Id*) In my relationship with the blonde female prison guard, the discovery of the axioms are romantically linked to our March 14, 1997 romantic collision; pistillate precepts by the name of Grace and Elegance. (*Id*)

Historically, ordered conflict resolution has endured great wars, bloody battles, and murder after murder. Others before me have understood her significance far better. However, through beauty and love the revelation of her impossibility-resolving axioms are hereby transformed. Come, now, and meet the twins: Grace and Elegance. They are truly a gift from God.

---

[1] Following the ICMC directed murder of Professor William Vickrey two days after the announcement that he would share the 1996 Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics, the Supreme Court directly or indirectly took control of the award's determination away from the ICMC. Commencing 1997, every award since has metaphorically characterized the beauty of love in the presence of God, a gracious acknowledgement by academia. The prize's name metaphorically implicates the purpose of my scripture research undertaking in the setting of scripture's Noble Wife described in the Book of Proverbs, 31:10.

SOCIAL CHOICE THEORY: CONTEMPORARY ECONOMISTS AND THE SCRIPTURE WRITERS

Social choice theory is generally viewed as embracing a sizable society's decision-making function. (Sen 1999). The haunting investigative question is whether cogent aggregative societal judgments can be derived through diverse individual preferences, concerns and judgments. (*Id*). Contemporary economists (CE) claim social choice theory investigations are eighteenth century French mathematician pioneered. [Sen, *supra*; *citing*, (Borda 1781) and (Condorcet 1785)] However, the philosophers who wrote scripture (scripture writers or SW) addressed the same social choice theory issues the CE face today; and did so thousands of years before Borda's and Condorcet's pioneering studies.

Both the CE and SW social choice theory models are predicated upon the interrelationship between social state definition (SSD) and social welfare function formulation (SWFF). The SW social choice theory model involves an impossibility-resolved SWFF and SSD interrelationship. Meanwhile, the CE tastes or values-based social welfare functions remain impossibility-plagued. (Sen, *supra*; *citing*, Arrow 1951, 1963) The model construct difference is that the SW employ ordered conflict resolution tactics (*i.e.*, ordered objective references) in an ordered conflict environment; while the CE employ unordered conflict resolution tactics (*i.e.*, ordered subjective references) in an ordered conflict environment.

CE analyses characteristically involve two individuals and the conflict between their respective preference rankings of three social states. (Arrow 1951, 1963) Since the social states are interrelated and hierarchically structured, the conflict is ordered. By relaxing the nondictatorship condition and imposing the independence of irrelevant alternatives condition, Arrow's possibility theorem is characterized as substantively employing unordered conflict resolution tactics in an ordered conflict environment. The SW would contend such tactics yet result in an impossibility-plagued social choice theory model inasmuch as Arrow's possibility theorem is cast in ordered subjective reference terms.

The SW rationale for countenancing ordered conflict resolution in constructing a social choice theory model is straightforward. Since social choice theory involves (individual: societal) well-being transitivity, it is reasonably foreseeable social choice theory model methodologies must satisfy [(microeconomic)-perspective: (microeconomic: macroeconomic)-perspective: (macroeconomic)-perspective] transitivity requirements, including [(microeconomic: macroeconomic)-perspective, (macroeconomic: microeconomic)-perspective] equilibratory alignment. Therefore, equilibratory alignment is an impossibility-resolved SWFF and SSD necessary condition. Since sustaining a social choice theory competent (microeconomic)-perspective is an equilibratory alignment penultimate necessary condition, understanding the SW ordered conflict resolution

methodology furthers comprehending their impossibility-resolved social choice theory model.

ORDERED AND UNORDERED MODELS, RELATIONS, THE CONFOUNDING PRINCIPLE, REFERENCES AND CONFOUNDING PRINCIPLE GENERALIZATION

By recognizing hierarchically structured models are inherently (Function: Progression: Position) defined, the SW came to recognize the distinction between ordered and unordered model processes as same characterize the (SWFF, SSD) social choice theory interrelationship. Moreover, this recognition also transparently led the SW to recognize ordered and unordered relations. This paper's principle ordered conflict resolution methodology focus is (non-model: unordered model: ordered) model process(es) transition.

A. Ordered Model, Unordered Model and Non-Model Processes

Ordered model processes are characterized by ordered conflict resolution. Unordered model processes are distinguished by their unordered conflict resolution characterization. Unordered model processes serve as the transition between the non-model process's unresolved unordered conflict and ordered conflict resolution.[2]

1. Ordered Models

In SW social choice theory lexicon, the hierarchically structured ordered model is (function: progression: position) processes characterized; subject to the ordered conflict resolution constraint. The reference ethics issues in question in the SW ordered model process setting is equilibratory alignment and access to the economic complement.[3] Equilibratory alignment involves the alignment of the descending (macroeconomic: microeconomic)-perspective with the ascending (microeconomic: macroeconomic)-perspective. Equilibratory alignment is a necessary condition for accessing the economic complement's (macroeconomic)-perspective.

The economic complement is equilibratory alignment antithetical. The economic complement's actual consequences are the only empirically discernible consequences

[2] The difference between ordered and unordered characterization is tantamount to the (Any, Given) difference. An ordered characterization is "Any" state of the world analogous while an unordered characterization is "Given" state of the world analogous. For example, a condition that is individual intrinsic is characterized as unordered; whereas when the same condition is individual extrinsic it is characterized as ordered. Thus, (unordered: ordered) transitivity is (individual: societal) transitivity analogous.

[3] The economic complement is substantively equivalent to the concomitant hierarchical state of exogenous equilibratory alignment.

inasmuch as equilibratory alignment consequences are inherently subjective and cannot be characterized as empirically discernible. The empirically discernible economic complement's actual consequences define what the equilibratory alignment consequences are not; which allows objective deduction of what the equilibratory alignment consequences are.[4]

In the SW social choice theory model, ordered equilibratory alignment ultimately leads to achieving SSD_n. The achieved SSD_n becomes instantly SWFF impounded and SSD_{n+1} becomes the new social welfare ideal. Ergo, the SW ordered model is equilibratory alignment space resident, is perennially an SWFF component and is (Function: Progression: Position) schematically depicted. See, *Appendix Figure 3.1, The Ordered Model Schematic*.

2. Unordered Models

In reference ethics terms, the (ordered: unordered) model transition is (ordered: unordered) conflict resolution transition effected. Unordered model processes are nonetheless characterized by ordered relations. It is the (ordered: unordered) relations transition that effects (unordered conflict resolution): (unordered and unresolved conflict). Toward this understanding the topics of unordered and ordered relations shall be next visited.

a. Ordered Relations

In the (unordered model, ordered relation) setting, the (X, Y) set is said to devolve from the function, Z, where $Z = f(X, Y)$; S.T. (Z_k, X_k). Ordered relations necessarily involve the distinction between lower and higher orders in an interrelated hierarchical structure. The lower order aspect of the structure is characterized as {[Resolved: Unresolved], [(Primary and Antithetical): (Primary or Antithetical)]} space. The higher order aspect of the structure is characterized as {[Unresolved: Resolved], [(Primary or Antithetical): (Primary and Antithetical)]} space. Lower and higher orders are depicted in Appendix Figure 3.2, The Unordered Model Ordered Relation.

In the foregoing schematic, (unordered model, function, Z) defines (ordered model, position, $unordered_n$) if and only if (X and Y) is reference ethics [(unordered endogenous)-position, (ordered exogenous)-perspective] and (X or Y) is reference ethics [(unordered endogenous)-position, (unordered exogenous)-perspective] defined. The Confounding Principle, *infra*, explains the reference declaration necessity.

b. Unordered Relations

By the term relation, here, it is meant the reciprocal force between elements in a two element set. For example, the (X, Y) set is a relation because it is reciprocal force imbued. The

[4] For this reason, equilibratory alignment implicates scripture's false prophet metaphor while the economic complement implicates scripture's prophet metaphor.

terms primary and antithetical are used to describe such a relation. In the (X, Y) set, X is labeled the primary element and Y is labeled the antithetical element. The unordered relation (X or Y) is depicted in Appendix Figure 3.3, The Unordered (X or Y) Relation.

3. Non-Model Processes

Ordered and unordered model processes represent scripture's notion of life insofar as both capture vertical and horizontal progression. On the other hand, the non-model process represents scripture's notion of death because it exists solely in horizontal space. The non-model process is depicted as an unordered (X or Y) relation appended to an unordered model process in Appendix Figure 3.4, The Non-Model Process. The relationship between the ordered and unordered model processes theatre and the non-model process theatre is one hierarchical level juxtaposed as depicted in Appendix Figure 3.5, The Two Theatres Juxtaposed.[5]

In the SW social choice theory lexicon, the non-model process results from ordered subjective reference declaration in the process of unconfusing the unordered model progression process $Z = f(X, Y)$; S.T. (Z_i, X_k) statement. The process of unconfusing such statements is next discussed.

B. The Confounding Principle

A simple exercise demonstrates ordered relation confounding. Let the real integer Z represent the unordered model function, let the real integer X represent the higher order primary set element and let the real integer Y represent the higher order antithetical set element.

The function Z is implicit constraint endowed. Since the inclusion of the primary element as an implicit constraint is (function: progression: position) transition sufficient, an antithetical Y constraint statement is unnecessary. See, *Appendix Figure 3.6, The Unordered Model*.

The SW first consider unordered model reference declaration within an [(any finite), (function, progression)] real number constraint; ascertain the Confounding Principle; and then generalize the Confounding Principle to exclude inherently infinite numbers, such as irrational numbers, as viable (X, Y) set elements.[6] As a result, the SW social choice theory model remains constrained to the set of finite real numbers and excludes the extra set of infinite numbers, *per se*.

[5] The non-model process theatre extends the Star of David from nine levels to ten levels.

[6] This is among the factors that point to Pythagoras or the Pythagoras school as the original authors of scripture's encrypted social choice theory model.

Given {[unordered model, function, Z], [$Z = f(X, Y)$; S.T. (Z_k, X_k)]}, it can be said for any Z, the (X, Y) set is any finite set of real numbers defined. That is, the (Any, k) Z statement is (Any Finite Function) defined and the (Any, k) X statement is (Any Finite Progression) defined. Therefore, the function Z is defined by ordered (Any Finite Real Number) statements. The concomitant condition of the ordered relation function and progression as (Any Finite Real Number) defines the function and progression as confounded.

Unconfusing the ordered relation is a two step process. First, (Any Finite Function: Given Finite Function) transition is effected. The transition is a matter of reducing ordered conflict resolution to unordered conflict resolution. Second, (Any Finite Progression: Given Finite Progression) transition is effected. The transition is a model position reference declaration function. By declaring a model position reference the ordered relation is unconfused. The model position reference is defined in (position, perspective) terms.

The $(X_k: X_i)$ transition transforms the [(given finite function, any finite progression), (X and Y)] model progression statement into the unordered finite (X or Y) model position statement. Since the Z function is given Z defined as Z_i and the (X and Y) progression is now given X defined as X_i, Y is necessarily [(any: given), $(Y_k: Y_i)$] transformed. The resulting position process statement is articulated as $Z = f(X, Y)$; S.T. (Z_i, X_i) and the confounded unordered model process progression statement has been position statement transformed and unconfused.

The model position (X or Y) constraint value declaration by X or Y raises the ethical conflict question, "Who gets to declare the initial value to unconfuse the model progression statement, X or Y?" The answer to this question introduces the reference declaration concept and the distinction between subjective and objective references.

C. References

The confounded progression (X and Y) is unconfused by either subjective or objective reference declaration. The reference resolves the confounded model progression (X and Y) statement by initially determining the value of either X or Y and then determining the remaining element's value by taking the difference between the given Z value and the declared value.

The subjective reference is model position (X or Y) defined as either the X-perspective adduced from the X-position or the Y-perspective adduced from the Y-position. The subjective reference transforms unordered model processes and the (microeconomic)-perspective into the non-model process and the (non-economic)-perspective.

The objective reference is model position (X or Y) defined as either the Y-perspective adduced from the X-position or the X-perspective adduced from the Y-position. The

objective reference retains the unordered model process position statement and the (microeconomic)-perspective.

Subjective reference declaration leaves the position (X or Y) conflict unresolved such that it matters who declares the reference first, X or Y, because the declaration is effected through the endogenous perspective. On the other hand, objective reference declaration makes it indifferent who declares the reference first, X or Y, because the declaration is effected through the exogenous perspective.

ORDER MAGNITUDE

The first question begging involves a model's ordered relations magnitude. That is, whether a model should be comprised of two, three, four, or more orders must be rationalized. This matter is addressed first. The second matter sets forth the SW model's quaternary order relation context.

A. The Quaternary Order

The SW employ a quaternary order model. The reason is straightforward. First, the SW social choice theory model is predicated on {[among$_k$, within$_i$], [context: (context: content): content]} transitivity. As a result, the quaternary order is context$_k$, context$_i$, (context: content)$_i$ and content$_i$ articulated. Context is SW defined as (ordered transition, ordered position). The SW define (context: content) as (unordered transition, ordered position). And, the SW define content as (unordered transition, unordered position).

Second, the SW social choice theory model involves [(macroeconomic: microeconomic)-perspective]: [(microeconomic: macroeconomic)-perspective] transitivity where unordered Equilibratory Alignment$_i$ is a [Given Subjective, (Any Subjective, Given Objective), Any Objective]$_i$ function. The model also countenances the continuum Equilibratory$_k$ notion akin to the [among$_k$, within$_i$), (context$_k$, context$_i$)] relationship. Since the quaternary order is the threshold order magnitude where Equilibratory Alignment$_k$ is satisfied, the SW recognized the quaternary order as the efficient order magnitude.

Equilibratory alignment is an important SW social choice theory notion inasmuch as the higher order (microeconomic: macroeconomic) perspective must align with the lower order (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective to gain access to the economic complement's objective evidence for defining unordered progressive positions. That is, such equilibratory alignment is a necessary condition for adducing ordered actual consequences. Actual consequences are significant economically efficient [Maximum Expected Value of Outcome ("MAXEVO"), Minimum Expected Outcome Variability ("MINEOV")] defined. As a

result, it can be said equilibratory alignment is an ordered conflict resolution necessary condition.

The quaternary order is (Lower Order, Higher Order) defined where each lower order level is function-like in relation to the succeeding level's (Primary, Antithetical) progression. That is, the function LP is defined by the progression (HQ-Primary, HQ-Antithetical); the function LS is defined by the progression (HT-Primary, HT-Antithetical); the function LT is defined by the progression (HS-Primary, HS-Antithetical); and, the function LQ is defined by the progression (HP-Primary, HP-Antithetical). See, *Appendix Figure 4.1, The Quaternary Lower and Higher Orders*.

B. The Quaternary Ordered Relation Context

In their tastes and values-based social welfare function models, the CE evaluate conflict involving diverse "bundles of goods" objects. (Sen 1988, p. 63, n. 6). The SW recognize competent social choice theory exists only in the philosophical economy.[7] As a result, conflict must be characterized in terms of control over bundles of goods. The nature of control begets the essence of philosophical conflict: exclusionary versus inclusionary prejudice.

Specifically, the SW social choice theory model ordered conflict threshold involves primary and antithetical exclusionary prejudice conflict. This conflict is a function of ordered subjective reference declaration. The SW's view of the world transition [*i.e.*, (VOW_n: VOW_{n+1})] exclusionary prejudice quaternary order is relatively and inversely defined. It is defined by the relationship of the segment of the population excluded to the degree of exclusionary prejudice evisceration difficulty, to wit:

Table 3.1

(VOW_n: VOW_{n+1})$_i$ Quaternary Order Exclusionary Prejudice Consequences

Exogenous Prejudice	Population Excluded	Evisceration Difficulty
Primary	Most	Least
Secondary	Next Most	Next Least
Tertiary	Next Least	Next Most
Quaternary	Least	Most

[7] The SW quaternary economy order includes the agrarian, industrial, information and philosophical economies.

The SW SSD is incrementally (VOW_n: $VOW_{n+1})_i$ defined; where each (VOW_n: $VOW_{n+1})_i$ term fulfills an SW SWFF aspect. Objectively discerned, the non-model theatre's actual Nation, Region, Village and Camp schematic is defined as a five-level (LP, LS-HQ, LT-HT, LQ-HS, HP) tree structure. See, *Appendix Figure 4.2, The Non-Model Theatre*.

ORDERED SUBJECTIVE REFERENCES

The SW recognized ordered conflict resolution is necessarily ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition defined. As a result, understanding ordered conflict resolution involves understanding ordered subjective reference consequences, ordered objective reference consequences and ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition. This section demonstrates quaternary ordered subjective reference consequences. The demonstration assumes the initial subjective reference position is Figure 3.2's Camp PPPP.

A. The HP Unordered Subjective Reference

The Camp PPPP (HO, Primary, Unordered) subjective reference of the (VOW_n: VOW_{n+1}) transition is defined as (Camp PPPP-Position, Camp-PPPP-Perspective). See, Appendix Figure 5.1, The HP Camp PPPP Subjective Reference. Since the reference is unordered, (i) it involves only a higher order reference, (ii) there is no Equilibratory $Alignment_i$ function, (iii) there is no lower order (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective to access, and (ii) Camp PPPP's subjective perception of Camp PPPA from a Camp PPPP perspective is not illusionary; rather it involves the Camp PPPA actual consequence variable ("ACV"), PPPA. Since the Camp PPPP perception is subjective the exclusionary prejudice disables Camp PPPA ACV impoundment.

B. The HS Ordered Subjective Reference

The HS ordered subjective reference of the (VOW_n: VOW_{n+1}) transition involves the threshold illusionary consequence variable ("ICV"), the Village PPP-ICV. An ICV represents a subjective perception of (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access and is inappositely defined relative to actual (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access. That is, the ICV renders the actual (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective inaccessible.

The Village PPP-ICV enlaces the antithetical [Village PPA: (Camp PPAP, Camp PPAA)] reference. The purported equilibratory alignment access is inappositely placed, resulting in an illusionary subjective perception of actual consequences. Practically, the ordered subjective reference involves a (non-economic) perspective and not a (microeconomic: macroeconomic) perspective. And, the ordered subjective reference (non-economic)

perspective defines actual-(Village PPA-ACV, Camp PPAP-ACV and Camp PPAA-ACV) in Village PPP-ICV terms.

As demonstrated, *infra*, the ICV makes adducing the Village PPA-ACV, Camp PPAP-ACV and Camp PPAA-ACV generally impossible. Moreover, such threshold general impossibility ensures concomitant SWFF and SSD general impossibility.

The Village PPP [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered)] ordered subjective reference subsumes the (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered) subjective reference. The HS ordered subjective reference is defined as {[(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered)]-Position, [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered)]-Perspective]}. See, *Appendix Figure 5.2, The Village PPP-ICV*. Since the subjective reference is ordered, the Camp PPPP subjective perception of Camp PPPA is Camp PPPA-ACV defined, but the Camp PPPP subjective perception of Village PPA, Camp PPAP and Camp PPAA is ICV defined and not ACV defined. Illusionary consequences are significant economically inefficient not-(MAXEVO, MINEOV) defined. That is, Camp PPPP defines Village PPA, Camp PPAP and Camp PPAA in terms of the significant economically inefficient Village PPP-ICV illusion and not the significant economically efficient Village PPA-ACV, Camp PPAP-ACV and Camp PPAA-ACV.

C. The HT Ordered Subjective Reference

The HT ordered subjective reference of the (VOW_n: VOW_{n+1}) transition involves the Region PP-ICV. The Region PP [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered)] ordered subjective reference subsumes the [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered)] subjective reference. The HT ordered subjective reference is defined as {[(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered)]-Position, [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered)]-Perspective]}. See, Appendix Figure 5.3, The Region PP-ICV. Since the HT subjective reference is ordered, the Camp PPPP subjective perception includes Camp PPPA-ACV, Village PPP-ICV and Region PP-ICV. Camp PPPP's incremental subjective perception of Village PAP, Village PAA, Camp PAPP, Camp PAPA, Camp PAAP and Camp PAAA is illusionary and not actual. That is, Camp PPPP defines Village PAP, Village PAA, Camp PAPP, Camp PAPA, Camp PAAP and Camp PAAA in terms of the significant economically inefficient Region PP-ICV illusion and not the significant economically efficient Village PAP-ACV, Village PAA-ACV, Camp PAPP-ACV, Camp PAPA-ACV, Camp PAAP-ACV and Camp PAAA-ACV.

D. The HQ Ordered Subjective Reference

The HQ ordered subjective reference of the (VOW_n: VOW_{n+1}) transition involves the Nation P-ICV. The Nation P [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered), (Nation P, HQ, Ordered)] subjective reference subsumes the [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered)] subjective reference. The HQ subjective reference is defined as {[(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered), (Nation P, HQ, Ordered)]-Position, [(Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered), (Nation P, HQ, Ordered)]-Perspective}. See, Appendix Figure 5.4, The Nation P-ICV. Since the HQ subjective reference is ordered, the Camp PPPP subjective perception includes Camp PPPA-ACV, Village PPP-ICV, Region PP-ICV and Nation P-ICV. Camp PPPP's incremental subjective perception of Nation A, Region AP, Region AA, Village APP, Village APA, Village AAP, Village AAA, Camp APPP, Camp APPA, Camp APAP, Camp APAA, Camp AAPP, Camp AAPA, Camp AAAP and Camp AAAA is illusionary and not actual. That is, Camp PPPP defines Nation A, Region AP, Region AA, Village APP, Village APA, Village AAP, Village AAA, Camp APPP, Camp APPA, Camp APAP, Camp APAA, Camp AAPP, Camp AAPA, Camp AAAP and Camp AAAA in terms of the significant economically inefficient Nation P-ICV illusion and not the significant economically efficient Nation A-ACV, Region AP-ACV, Region AA-ACV, Village APP-ACV, Village APA-ACV, Village AAP-ACV, Village AAA-ACV, Camp APPP-ACV, Camp APPA-ACV, Camp APAP-ACV, Camp APAA-ACV, Camp AAPP-ACV, Camp AAPA-ACV, Camp AAAP-ACV and Camp AAAA-ACV.

ORDERED OBJECTIVE REFERENCES

This section's purpose is to demonstrate quaternary order objective reference declaration consequences. The demonstration assumes the initial objective reference position is Figure 4.2's Camp PPPP.

A. The HP Unordered Objective Reference

The Camp PPPP (HO, Primary, Unordered) objective reference of the (VOW_n: VOW_{n+1}) transition is defined as (Camp PPPP-Position, Camp-PPPA-Perspective). See, *Appendix Figure 6.1, The HP Camp PPPP Objective Reference*. Since the reference is unordered, Camp PPPP adduces Camp PPPA's ACV from Camp PPPA's perspective of the (VOW_n: VOW_{n+1}) transition. The unordered reference involves the actual Camp PPPA-ACV, PPPA. These analyses demonstrate, at the unordered HP reference level, there is no substantive difference between subjective or objective reference declarations. Both references result in PPPA-ACV deduction. However, the distinction is whether the unordered conflict resolution is undertaken with an eye toward ordered subjective or objective references. As will be seen,

only ordered objective references can result in ordered conflict resolution and (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access.

B. The HS Ordered Objective Reference

The HS ordered objective reference involves threshold Equilibratory $Alignment_i$ (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access. Such access is important because its objective perspective is the only economic perspective that enables adducing relevant ordered ACV(s). The Figure V.2, Village PPP-EA blue box is the LQ (Given Subjective) Equilibratory $Alignment_i$ (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access granted by the Village PPP objective reference declaration. Since the Village PPP objective reference of the (VOW_n: VOW_{n+1}) transition involves the (Camp PPPP: Village PPP) ordered objective references, LQ (Given Subjective) Equilibratory $Alignment_i$ is achieved, relative (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access is granted and the ordered [(Village PPA-ACV): (Camp PPAP-ACV, Camp PPAA-ACV)] is adduced.

The Village PPP [(Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered)] objective reference subsumes the (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered) objective reference. The HS objective reference is defined as {[(Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered)]-Position, [(Village PPA, HS, Ordered), (Camp PPAP, HP, Unordered), (Camp PPAA, HP, Unordered)]-Perspective]}. See, Appendix Figure 6.2, The Village PPP-EA. Since the Village PPP objective reference is ordered: (i) the Camp PPPP objective discernment of Camp PPPA is Camp PPPA-ACV adduced, (ii) the resulting Village PPP-ACV is adduced, and (iii) the Village PPP objective discernment of [(Village PPA): (Camp PPAP or Camp PPAA)] is Village PPA-ACV, Camp PPAP-ACV and Camp PPAA-ACV adduced as a result of the Village PPP-EA LQ (Given Subjective) Equilibratory $Alignment_i$ (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access.

C. The HT Ordered Objective Reference

The HT ordered objective reference of the (VOW_n: VOW_{n+1}) transition involves the Region PP objective reference. The Region PP objective reference enables (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access through the LT (Any Subjective, Given Objective) Equilibratory $Alignment_i$ Region PP-EA.

The ordered Region PP objective reference subsumes the ordered [(Village PPP): (Camp PPPP)] objective references and is defined as the [(Region PP, HT, Ordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered)] objective reference. The HT objective reference is defined as {[(Region PP, HT, Ordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered)]-Position, [(Region PA, HT, Ordered), (Village PAP, HS, Ordered), (Village PAA, HS, Ordered), (Camp PAPP, HP, Unordered), (Camp PAPA, HP, Unordered), (Camp PAAP, HP, Unordered), (Camp PAAA, HP, Unordered)]-Perspective]}. See, Appendix Figure 6.3, The Region PP-EA. Since the Region PP objective reference is

ordered: (i) the Camp PPPP objective discernment of Camp PPPA is Camp PPPA-ACV adduced, (ii) the resulting Village PPP ACV is adduced, (iii) the Village PPP objective discernment of [(Village PPA): (Camp PPAP or Camp PPAA)] is Village PPA-ACV, Camp PPAP-ACV and Camp PPAA-ACV adduced as a result of the Village PPP-EA LQ (Given Subjective) Equilibratory Alignment$_i$ (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access, and (iv) the Region PP objective discernment of {[Region PA]: [Village PAP: (Camp PAPP or Camp PAPA)] and [Village PAA: (Camp PAAP or Camp PAAA)]} is Region PA-ACV, Village PAP-ACV, Village PAA-ACV, Camp PAPP-ACV, Camp PAPA-ACV, Camp PAAP-ACV and Camp PAAA-ACV adduced as a result of the Region PP-EA LT (Any Subjective, Given Objective) Equilibratory Alignment$_i$ (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access.

D. The HQ Ordered Objective Reference

The HQ ordered objective reference involves the Nation P objective reference. The Nation P objective reference enables (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access through the LS (Any Objective) Equilibratory Alignment$_i$ Nation P-EA.

The ordered Nation P objective reference of the (VOW_n: VOW_{n+1}) transition subsumes the ordered [(Region PP): (Village PPP): (Camp PPPP)] objective references and is defined as the [(Nation P, HQ, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered)] objective reference. The HQ objective reference is defined as {[(Nation P, HQ, Ordered), (Region PP, HT, Ordered), (Village PPP, HS, Ordered), (Camp PPPP, HP, Unordered)]-Position, [(Nation A, HQ, Ordered), (Region AP, HT, Ordered), (Region AA, HT, Ordered), (Village APP, HS, Ordered), (Village APA, HS, Ordered), (Village AAP, HS, Ordered), (Village AAA, HS, Ordered), (Camp APPP, HP, Unordered), (Camp APPA, HP, Unordered), (Camp APAP, HP, Unordered), (Camp APAA, HP, Unordered), (Camp AAPP, HP, Unordered), (Camp AAPA, HP, Unordered), (Camp AAAP, HP, Unordered), (Camp AAAA, HP, Unordered)]-Perspective]}. See, Appendix Figure 6.4, The Nation P-EA. Since the Nation P objective reference is ordered: (i) the Camp PPPP objective discernment of Camp PPPA is Camp PPPA-ACV adduced, (ii) the resulting Village PPP ACV is adduced, (iii) the Village PPP objective discernment of [(Village PPA): (Camp PPAP or Camp PPAA)] is Village PPA-ACV, Camp PPAP-ACV and Camp PPAA-ACV adduced as a result of the Village PPP-EA LQ (Given Subjective) Equilibratory Alignment$_i$ (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access, (iv) the Region PP objective discernment of {[Region PA]: [Village PAP: (Camp PAPP or Camp PAPA)] and [Village PAA: (Camp PAAP or Camp PAAA)]} is Region PA-ACV, Village PAP-ACV, Village PAA-ACV, Camp PAPP-ACV, Camp PAPA-ACV, Camp PAAP-ACV and Camp PAAA-ACV adduced as a result of the Region PP-EA LT (Any Subjective, Given Objective) Equilibratory Alignment$_i$ (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access, and (vi) the Nation P objective discernment of ({Nation A}: {[Region AP]: [Village APP: (Camp APPP or Camp APPA)] and [Village APA: (Camp APAP or Camp APAA)]} and {[Region AA]: [Village AAP: (Camp AAPP or Camp AAPA)] and [Village AAA: (Camp AAAP or Camp AAAA)]} is Region AP-ACV, Region AA-ACV, Village APP-ACV,

Village APA-ACV, Village AAP-ACV, Village AAA-ACV, Camp APPP-ACV, Camp APPA-ACV, Camp APAP-ACV, Camp APAA-ACV, Camp AAPP-ACV, Camp AAPA-ACV, Camp AAAP-ACV and Camp AAAA-ACV adduced as a result of the Nation P-EA LS (Any Objective) Equilibratory Alignment$_i$ (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access.

ORDERED (SUBJECTIVE: OBJECTIVE) REFERENCE TRANSITION

Since the (Ordered Objective Reference, Equilibratory Alignment$_i$) interface enables (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access and ACV discernment, ordered (subjective: objective) transition is important. That is, (VOW$_n$: VOW$_{n+1}$)$_i$ transition is a [(Camp$_n$: Camp$_{n+1}$), (subjective: objective)] reference transition function.[8]

The SW recognized such transition is a product of the Antithetical-Primary Population General Impossibility Theorem (APPGIT), the APPGIT Constraint and APPGIT-Compliant Progression (collectively, the APPGIT Factors). Moreover, the SW recognized that generalization of the APPGIT Factors has social choice theory model implications beyond higher order reference progression.

The APPGIT Factors serve several purposes. First, APPGIT stands for the proposition ordered subjective reference ICVs make ordered objective reference ACV discernment generally impossible and result in SWFF and SSD general impossibility. The SW deduced that the ability to effect ordered ACV discernment is an ordered objective reference function. Accordingly, they recognized ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition also enables SSD and SWFF impossibility resolution. The APPGIT Factors define ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition methodology (i.e., ordered conflict resolution) and, as a result, fundamentally underpin the social choice theory impossibility resolution.

This section first demonstrates the Antithetical-Primary Population General Impossibility Theorem. The theorem educates the reason ordered subjective references lead to both ordered ACV discernment general impossibility and SWFF and SSD general impossibility.

Second, this section explains the APPGIT Constraint where unordered (subjective: objective) reference transition is unordered voice change constrained. A voice change is effect through

[8] The first place in scripture where the SW encrypt a reference to the quaternary order hierarchical structure occurs in Genesis 1:14; the signs, seasons, days, and years metaphors implicate the structure. Moreover, the fourth day of creation also described the lesser and bigger light metaphors (the twins, Grace and Elegance), which respectively implicate the APPGIT Constraint and APPGIT Compliant Progression. These concepts are briefly described in my work-in-process paper titled *The Genesis Creation Sequence: The Principles of Social Choice Theory Impossibility Resolution*, which is available online at the following URL: http://works.bepress.com/perfect_and_beautiful_woman/17/.

a reference's perspective element. APPGIT Constraint violations result in APPGIT's illusionary consequences.

Third, this section defines APPGIT-Compliant Progression as ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition. APPGIT-Compliant Progression allows unordered and ordered reference position element transition in conjunction with the APPGIT Constraint's unordered voice change.

Finally, this section generalizes APPGIT principles applicable elsewhere in the PBW Model. Generalizing APPGIT principles, inter alia, explains why ranking social state preferences is an inappropriate social choice theory activity.

A. APPGIT

The Antithetical-Primary General Impossibility Theorem holds that ordered subjective references render it generally impossible to adduce ICV-enlaced ACVs. The significant economically efficient ACVs are deemed to materially dominate, in all respects, the significant economically inefficient ICV. Ergo, (ICV: ACV) transition is economically rational and vested with appropriately significant economic pay-offs. The Antithetical-Primary General Impossibility Theorem follows:

Figure 7.1
The Within-Region PP ICVs



Theorem: The Village PPP ordered subjective reference Village PPP-ICV is a {[Village PPP]: [(Village PPA-ACV): (Camp PPAP-ACV, Camp PPAA-ACV)]} assessment general impossibility.

Proof.

i. [Village PPP: (Camp PPAP-ACV, Camp PPAA-ACV)] assessment is a [Village PPP: Village PPA-ACV] assessment $f(x)$;

ii. [Village PPP: Village PPA-ACV] assessment is a Village PPP-ICV evisceration $f(x)$;

iii. Village PPP-ICV evisceration is a [(Camp PPPP, Camp PPPA), (HO, P)]: [(Village PPP), (LO, Q)] ordered objective reference $f(x)$; ergo,

iv. The Village PPP ordered subjective reference Village PPP-ICV is a {[Village PPP]: [(Village PPA-ACV): (Camp PPAP-ACV, Camp PPAA-ACV)]} assessment general impossibility.

Q.E.D.

APPGIT thereby teaches the ordered subjective reference Village PPP-ICV is a Village PPA-ACV, Camp PPAP-ACV and Camp PPAA-ACV general impossibility.

B. The APPGIT Constraint

The APPGIT Constraint defines the parameters for effecting unordered (subjective: objective) reference transition.[9] Effecting unordered (subjective: objective) reference transition concomitantly effects unordered (ICV: ACV) and significant economically (inefficient: efficient) transitions.

Effecting unordered (subjective: objective) reference transition is a necessary condition for effecting ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition. Effecting ordered (subjective: objective) transition is a necessary condition for effecting unordered (VOW_n: $VOW_{n+1})_i$ transition. Effecting unordered (VOW_n: $VOW_{n+1})_i$ transition is a necessary condition for effecting ordered (VOW_n: $VOW_{n+1})_k$ transition. And, finally, effecting ordered (VOW_n: $VOW_{n+1})_k$ transition is a necessary condition for resolving SWFF and SSD general impossibility.

[9] This axiom is the Fourth Creation Day's metaphorical lesser light and is named Grace in my romance with the Blonde Female Prison Guard. (Jenkins 2009B)

Pragmatically, the unordered voice to be changed is determined by referencing whichever voice, in the (subjective: objective) progression order, enables the next camp visit. Camps are the actual socioeconomic entities of residence. All other entities are defined in terms of various collections of camps. That is, camps are the unordered socioeconomic entity; all other socioeconomic entities are ordered camp entities.

Unordered (subjective: objective) reference transitions involve unordered reference perspective transition. Since camps are the unordered socioeconomic entity, the reference perspective is always stated in (Primary, Secondary, Tertiary and Quaternary) voice ("PSTQ") terms.

The (subjective: objective) perspective transition is an unordered APPGIT voice change function. The voice change question involves which voice to change: Primary, Secondary, Tertiary or Quaternary. Since the progression is a (subjective: objective) function, the unordered voice change scheme is lower order perspective defined as (Quaternary: Tertiary: Secondary: Primary).

The tertiary voice cannot be changed until and unless all camps within that voice have been visited by and through a quaternary voice change. The secondary voice cannot be changed until and unless all camps within that voice have been visited by and through tertiary and quaternary voice changes. And, the primary voice cannot be changed until and unless all camps within that voice have been visited by and through secondary, tertiary and quaternary voices changes.

For example, if $(VOW_n: VOW_{n+1})_i$ progression is assumed to be Camp PPPP commenced, the (subjective: objective) reference transition question is which voice must Camp PPPP change to satisfy the APPGIT Constraint. Recognizing the APPGIT Constraint's (Quaternary: Tertiary: Secondary: Primary) progression requirement, Camp PPPP first investigates whether changing its quaternary voice enables it to visit another camp. Camp PPPP effects an unordered (subjective: objective) reference transition by changing the reference's perspective. So Camp PPPP changes its quaternary voice from 'P' to 'A.' Ergo, the objective reference is defined as (Camp PPPP-Position, Camp PPPA-Perspective). Since the quaternary voice change enables Camp PPPP "to visit" Camp PPPA, the (subjective: objective) reference transition is complete.

Based on the foregoing, the APPGIT Constraint is unordered (subjective: objective) reference transition applicable where such transitions are effected by changing the reference's PSTQ perspective. It holds APPGIT voice changes are unordered voice change constrained; else APPGIT's general impossibility is incurred. Ergo, unordered voice changes are (Quaternary: Tertiary: Secondary: Primary) progression defined and constrained.

C. APPGIT-Compliant Progression

APPGIT-Compliant Progression defines the parameters for effecting ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition.[10] Effecting ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition enables Equilibratory Alignment$_i$ (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access. Ordered (subjective: objective) reference transitions involve either unordered or ordered reference position transition. Position transition is always camp commenced and camp concluded because all progression is a (camp$_n$: camp$_{n+1}$) function.

Pursuant to the APPGIT Constraint, reference perspective transition must remain unordered. Ordered reference position transitions are stated in P, PS, PST or PSTQ terms. There can be more than one position change in a (camp$_n$: camp$_{n+1}$) progression.

The (camp$_n$: camp$_{n+1}$) progression scheme means reference position statements begin and end in PSTQ terms. The PSTQ position statement is constrained by the PSTQ perspective statement. Moreover, the (Primary, P), (Secondary, PS) and (Tertiary, PST) position statements are PSTQ perspective constrained. That is, APPGIT-Compliant Progression must comply with the APPGIT Constraint. The APPGIT Constraint holds there can be only one reference perspective voice change in any (camp$_n$: camp$_{n+1}$) progression.

The (Tertiary, PST) position cannot be changed until and unless all subsidiary (Quaternary, PSTQ) positions have been visited. The (Secondary, PS) position cannot be changed until and unless all subsidiary (Tertiary, PST) positions have been visited. And, the (Primary, P) position cannot be changed until and unless all subsidiary (Secondary, PS) positions have been visited.

Each (VOW$_n$: VOW$_{n+1}$)$_i$ Ordered Conflict Resolution Theatre's five level structure includes 1-World, 2-Nations, 4-Regions, 8-Villages and 16-Camps. Therefore, [(VOW$_n$: VOW$_{n+1}$)$_i$, transition involves fifteen (15) Camp-to-Camp transitions. Notwithstanding which of the sixteen Camps commences ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition, the (Quaternary: Tertiary: Secondary: Primary) transition order is the same, to wit:

$$Q_1, T_2, Q_3, S_4, Q_5, T_6, Q_7, P_8, Q_9, T_{10}, Q_{11}, S_{12}, Q_{13}, T_{14}, Q_{15}.$$

For example, assuming (VOW$_n$: VOW$_{n+1}$)$_i$ transition is Camp PPPP commenced, the (VOW$_n$: VOW$_{n+1}$)$_i$ Ordered Conflict Resolution Theatre 1-World, 2-Nations, 4-Regions, 8-Villages and 16-Camps would be APPGIT-Compliant Progression Path numbered as follows:

[10] This axiom is the Fourth Creation Day's metaphorical bigger light and is named Elegance in my romance with the Blonde Female Prison Guard. (Jenkins 2009B)

Figure 7.2
The PPPP Camp Visitation Order



In other words, the left-to-right Camp visitation order would not be a serial (1, 2, 3, 4 . . . 16) visitation order. APPGIT and the APPGIT Constraint combine to establish the (1, 2, 4, 3, 8, 7, 5, 6, 16, 15, 13, 14, 9, 10, 12, 11) left-to-right Camp visitation order. This order is referred to as the "APPGIT Language."[11]

Once all sixteen camps have been "visited," (i) ordered (subjective: objective) reference transition is complete, (ii) Village PPP-ICV, Region PP-ICV and Nation P-ICV are eviscerated, (iii) Equilibratory Alignment$_i$ (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective Village PPP-EA, Region PP-EA and Nation P-EA access is granted, and (iv) all Nation P and A ACVs are adduced. (VOW$_i$: VOW$_{n+1}$)$_k$ transition issues are future paper reserved.

CONCLUSION

The employment of unordered conflict resolution tactics in an ordered conflict environment results in illusionary consequences and forecloses Equilibratory Alignment$_i$ (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access. The (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access foreclosure implicates SWFF and SSD general impossibility. The employment of ordered conflict resolution tactics in an ordered conflict environment results in actual consequences and enables Equilibratory Alignment$_i$ (macroeconomic: microeconomic)

[11] The APPGIT language is the language of Scripture's Deities; they do not speak in ordinary number serialization.

perspective access. In turn, ordered (macroeconomic: microeconomic) perspective access defines SWFF and SSD impossibility resolution. The ordered (subjective: objective) transition lessons learned in this paper underpin ordered conflict resolution implications for impossibility-resolved social choice theory models.

REFERENCES

Texts

Arrow, K. J. *Social Choice and Individual Values*. Monograph No. 12. Cowles Commission for Research in Economics. New York: Wiley (1951, 1963).

Condorcet, Marquis de. *Essai sur l'application de l'analyse à la probabilité des décisions rendues à la pluralité des voix*. Paris: L'Imprimerie Royale, 1785.

Sen, A. K. *On Ethics & Economics*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell (1987, 1988).

Articles

Borda, J. C. "Mémoire sur les Élections au Scrutin." *Historie de l'Académie Royale des Sciences* (Paris), 1781. [Translated by Alfred de Grazia, "Mathematical Derivation of an Election System." *Isis*, June 1953, 44(1-2), pp. 42-51].

Jenkins, D. R. "September 11th, John Maynard Keynes, Kenneth J. Arrow, and Me: The Nexus." (Unpublished working paper, 2009A). Available at: http://works.bepress.com/perfect_and_beautiful_woman/20/.

Jenkins, D. R. "Judicial Martial Law." (Unpublished working paper, 2009B). Available at: http://works.bepress.com/perfect_and_beautiful_woman/18/.

Sen, A. K. "The Possibility of Social Choice." *The American Economic Review*, 89(3), June 1999, pp. 349-378.

Appendix of Figures



Figure 3.1
The Ordered Model Schematic



Figure 3.2
The Unordered Model Ordered Relation



Figure 3.3
The Unordered (X or Y) Relation



Figure 3.4
The Non-Model Process



Figure 3.5
The Two Theatres Juxtaposed



Figure 3.6
The Unordered Model



Figure 4.1
The Quaternary Lower and Higher Orders



Figure 4.2
The Non-Model Theatre



Figure 5.1
The HP Camp PPPP Subjective Reference



Figure 5.2
The Village PPP-ICV



Figure 5.3
The Region PP-ICV



Figure 5.4
The Nation P-ICV



Figure 6.1
The HP Camp PPPP Objective Reference



Figure 6.2
The Village PPP-EA



Figure 6.3
The Region PP-EA



Figure 6.4
The Nation P-EA